

FORM 26. Docketing Statement

Form 26 (p. 1)
July 2020

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

DOCKETING STATEMENT

Case Number: 23-1356

Short Case Caption: Regents of the University of California v. Satco Products, Inc.

Filing Party/Entity: Satco Products, Inc.

Instructions: Complete each section or check the box if a section is intentionally blank or not applicable. Attach additional pages as needed. Refer to the court's Mediation Guidelines for filing requirements. An amended docketing statement is required for each new appeal or cross-appeal consolidated after first filing.

Case Origin	Originating Number	Type of Case
USPTO/PTAB	IPR2021-00662	Inter Partes Review

Relief sought on appeal: ☐ None/Not Applicable

Affirmance of PTAB's final written decision on U.S. Patent No. 10,644,213

Relief awarded below (if damages, specify): ☐ None/Not Applicable

Claims 1-2 of U.S. Patent No. 10,644,213 have been proven unpatentable

Briefly describe the judgment/order appealed from:

In its final decision, the PTAB held that claims 1-2 of U.S. Patent No. 10,644,213 are unpatentable.

Nature of judgment (select one):

Date of judgment: 11/24/22

☒ Final Judgment, 28 USC § 1295

☐ Rule 54(b)

☐ Interlocutory Order (specify type) _____

☐ Other (explain) _____

FORM 26. Docketing Statement

Form 26 (p. 2)
July 2020

Name and docket number of any related cases pending before this court, and the name of the writing judge if an opinion was issued. ☐ None/Not Applicable

The Regents of the University of California v. International Trade Commission, Case No. 22-1521
The Regents of the University of California v. Satco Products, Inc., Case Nos. 22-1106, 22-1107, 22-1108, and 22-1109

Issues to be raised on appeal: ☐ None/Not Applicable

Affirmance of PTAB's Final Written Decision on U.S. Patent No. 10,644,213 in its entirety

Have there been discussions with other parties relating to settlement of this case?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If "yes," when were the last such discussions?

- ☐ Before the case was filed below
- ☒ During the pendency of the case below
- ☐ Following the judgment/order appealed from

If "yes," were the settlement discussions mediated? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If they were mediated, by whom?

Mr. Kent Stevens

Do you believe that this case may be amenable to mediation? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Explain.

Appellee does not believe that mediation would be productive

Provide any other information relevant to the inclusion of this case in the court's mediation program.

N/A

Date: 1/23/23 Signature: /s/ Nicholas A. Brown

Name: Nicholas A. Brown